

REMARKS

Nonelected Claims 1-17 have been cancelled.

Applicant acknowledges the allowance of Claims 18-27. Claims 21 has been amended to make it more readable.

Claims 28-33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Harness et al. (Spurious Mode Suppression in Electrostatic Comb Drive XY Microactuators).

Claim 28 is patentable over the Harness et al. device by calling for a micromechanical device of the type set forth therein in which, among other things, the movable member and the first microactuator are balanced in the first direction for inhibiting undesirable movement of the movable member in the first direction in response to externally applied accelerations to the device and the movable member and the second microactuator are balanced in the second direction for inhibiting undesirable movement of the movable member in the second direction in response to externally applied accelerations to the device.

Contrary to the assertion of the Examiner, it is not inherent that the supporting flexures of the Harness et al. microactuators balance the mover and inhibit motion from external accelerations. In this regard, Figure 1 of Harness et al. discloses hammock and folded flexure suspensions. The four arrows extending outwardly in each of the designs A and B of Figure 1 in Harness et al. appear to merely indicate the four directions of movement of the central table thereof. There is no suggestion or disclosure in Harness et al. that such four arrows disclose a device which is balanced for inhibiting undesirable movements in response to externally applied accelerations in the manner called for in Claim 28. Nor is there any suggestion in Harness et al. that the apparent symmetrical configuration of the designs of A and B of Figure 1 results in a balanced device as called for in Claim 28. Rather, it would appear that the Table in Figure 1 of the Harness et al. device would NOT be inhibited from moving in a horizontal direction in response to an externally applied acceleration of the device and would similarly NOT be inhibited from moving in a vertical direction in response to an externally applied acceleration of the device.

Claims 29-31 depend from Claim 28 and are patentable for the same reasons as Claim 28 and by reason of the additional limitations called for therein.

Claim 32 is patentable by calling for a micromechanical device of the type set forth therein having, among other things, balancing means carried by the substrate and coupled to the

actuator means for inhibiting motion of the movable member in response to externally applied accelerations in first and second substantially perpendicular directions. Contrary to the assertion of the Examiner, there is no suggestion or disclosure in Harness et al. of a balancing means of the type called for in Claim 32.

Claim 33 depends from Claim 32 and is patentable for the same reasons as Claim 32 and by reason of the additional limitation called for therein.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the claims of record are allowable and that the application should be passed to issue. Should the Examiner believe that the application is not in a condition for allowance and that a telephone interview would help further prosecution of this case, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the phone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Edward N. Bachand', written over the printed name.

Edward N. Bachand
Reg. No. 37,085

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP
Suite 3400, Four Embarcadero Center
San Francisco, CA 94111-4187
Telephone: (650) 494-8700
1065554